



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ἐρχομαι with the longevity interpretation. This would force us to understand Christ's words as equivalent to "Until I come, and thirty years afterward." And further, we should be obliged to suppose that, long after the ἔως ἐρχομαι was fulfilled, John was still doubtful as to its meaning. No! If the fall-of-Jerusalem interpretation be adopted, then it most naturally follows that John did not survive that catastrophe (*cf.* Matt. 22 : 6).

There remains the alternative of some less personal and wider spiritual suggestion in this idea of the beloved disciple tarrying (*cf.* 1 John 2 : 17, "He who doeth the will of God tarrieth forever"). But to go farther into the several possible explanations of ἔως ἐρχομαι would lead too far afield. The object of this article was, in the light of recent publications, simply to review the external evidence for and against the idea of John the apostle's death in Ephesus *circa* 100 A. D. On the one side we have little more than the belief of Irenæus, who, owing to homonymy, may easily have been mistaken (just as Hegesippus, Polycrates, etc., were in similar cases), and the statements in *Acta Johannis*, which are in a high degree fictitious. On the other side we have early historical evidence, which it is most difficult or impossible to set aside or explain away.

F. P. BADHAM.

LONDON, E. C.,
England.

THE BEARING OF THE COMPOSITION OF THE PSALTER ON THE DATE OF THE FORTY-FOURTH PSALM.

THE church fathers of the school of Antioch—Theodore of Mopsuestia, Chrysostom, and Theodoret—held that this psalm was spoken prophetically of the age of the Maccabees. In this opinion Calvin concurred. Many recent interpreters have held that it is one of the few, the internal evidence of which makes a Maccabæan origin practically certain. Such is the opinion of von Lengerke, Hitzig, Hupfeld, Nowack, Perowne, Driver, Cornill, Cheyne, Baethgen, Wellhausen, and Kautzsch—a formidable list. W. R. Smith in the first edition of his *Old Testament in the Jewish Church* inclined to this view,¹ but in the second edition he recedes from it, holding that it was composed in the time of Artaxerxes Ochus and the persecution of Bagoses.² Some eminent names may be cited as authorities for other dates, thus: de Wette assigned it to the reign of Jehoiakim; Kösters and Ewald to the sad

¹ *Cf.* pp. 196, 197.

² *Cf. ibid.*, pp. 207, 208.

times soon after the exile, about the end of the sixth or the beginning of the fifth century; Lagarde to the invasion of Sennacherib; while Delitzsch held that it is Davidic, and was composed at the time of his Syrian and Ammonitish wars. Such opinions make but little impression in comparison with the consensus in favor of a Maccabæan origin.

Before one decides in favor of that date, however, the history of the compilation of the Psalter, as it can be deduced from the titles of psalms and colophons of books, should be considered. Many commentators have called attention to the fact that the fivefold division of our Psalter points to a gradual collection of the Psalms, and that this view is strengthened (1) by the fact that some of these collections rest on previous collections; (2) that the colophon at the end of Ps. 72 indicates that when it was written no other Davidic psalms were known than those which preceded it, while several more occur in later parts of our present Psalter; and (3) that the musical names and directions in Books I-III of the Psalter had become obsolete when Books IV and V were written.³ The steps of the process by which our psalm-book was collected have been generally recognized to be the following: (1) the formation of the first Davidic collection, Pss. 3-41; (2) the collection of the Korahitic, Asaphic, and second Davidic psalters; (3) the union of these into one collection, when they underwent an Elohist editing; (4) the addition of the Yahwistic appendix to this collection (Pss. 84-89); (5) the formation of other small collections, such as the "Songs of Ascent" (Pss. 120-134); (6) the collection of Books IV and V, which were at the first one collection, but which was based in part on previous collections; (7) the possible addition of some later psalms (such as 135-150) at the end of the Psalter; (8) the division of the last collection into two books, so that the Psalter, like the Pentateuch, should consist of five books; and (9) the prefixing of Pss. 2 and 1 to the whole. These several steps may not have occurred in this exact order, but they are to be recognized. Of these several stages in the process three stand out prominently:

³ Cf. VON Lengerke, *Die fünf Bücher der Psalmen*, 1847, pp. xxxi ff.; Ewald, *Die Dichter des Alten Bundes*, 2. Aufl., 1866, pp. 242-67; W. R. Smith, *Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, 1st ed., 1881, pp. 183-205; 2d ed., 1892, pp. 195-214; Bleek, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, London, 1888, Vol. II, pp. 239-41; Perowne, *The Psalms*, 1890, Vol. I, pp. 70-83; Cornill, *Einleitung in das Alte Test.*, 1891, pp. 215 ff.; Peters, "The Development of the Psalter," *New World*, 1893, pp. 285-312; König, *Einleitung in das Alte Test.*, 1893, pp. 404 ff.; Sanday, *Inspiration*, 1893, pp. 271-3; Kirkpatrick, "The Psalms," in *The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*, 1892, pp. xxxix ff.; Kautzsch, *The Literature of the Old Testament*, 1899, pp. 141-8.

the formation of Book I, the first Yahwistic collection; the formation of the Elohist collection (Books II and III); and the formation of Books IV and V, the second Yahwistic collection. As to the dates when these collections were completed scholars are not agreed. Von Lengerke thought Nehemiah might have been the collector of Book I; that the Elohist portion must have been collected in the early Maccabæan time; and that the last collection was made in the time of Simon or John Hyrcanus.⁴ Ewald thought⁵ that the first collection was made from the tenth century to the deuteronomic period in the seventh; that the Elohist part was formed in Nehemiah's time; and, on the basis of the composite psalm in 1 Chron. 16: 8-36, that the Psalter was completed by the time of the chronicler in the last of the Persian or the beginning of the Greek period. W. R. Smith seemed inclined in the first edition of his *Old Testament in the Jewish Church*⁶ to refer Books IV and V to the Greek and probably to the Maccabæan period; the Korahitic and Asaphic collections to the times subsequent to Ezra and Nehemiah, admitting Pss. 44, 74, and 79 as Maccabæan; and the Davidic collections to earlier times. In the second edition he held that the inferior limit of the date of the Psalter is fixed by the Greek version which was current in Egypt about 130 B. C.⁷ He also in this edition recognized that it is difficult, on account of the literary history of the Psalter, to assign any psalm in Books II and III to a later time than the Persian period.⁸ Cornill holds (or held in 1891⁹) that the first book was not collected before 400 B. C., because the term *הַיְיָקִי* in Ps. 19: 2 shows dependence on the P document. He further holds that the *terminus ad quem* for the collection of the Psalter is to be found in the hymn of 1 Chron. 16: 8-36, though four psalms (44, 74, 79, and 83) are Maccabæan in origin and were inserted later. He holds that the quotation of Ps. 79: 2-3 as Scripture in 1 Macc. 7: 17 proves the Psalter as a whole to be considerably older than the Maccabæan period. Kirkpatrick¹⁰ holds that the first of these collections may have been begun by Solomon, and was certainly formed before the exile; that the second was completed about the time of the return; and that the third may be placed in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah. Dr. Peters holds¹¹ that the chronicler's psalm already referred to shows that about 330 B. C. the Psalter existed in its

⁴ *Op. cit.*, pp. xxxii, xxxiii. ⁷ P. 201.

⁹ *Einleitung*, pp. 216-18.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, pp. 256, 261-5. ⁸ Pp. 207 ff., 437 ff. ¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, pp. xliii, xlv.

⁶ Pp. 188 ff.

¹¹ *New World*, June, 1893, p. 299.

present fivefold division, but that it terminated at Ps. 134. Pss. 135-150, he holds, were added later, because they quote from psalms now contained in Books IV and V. The Yahwistic appendix to the Elohist portion of the Psalter indicates, he thinks, that Books II and III were collected between 500 and 450 B. C., while the first collection was probably made during the exile.¹² Kautzsch¹³ holds that the first collection (Pss. 3-41) was arranged about the time of Ezra. Toward the end of the Persian age the main body of Books II and III was collected, to which Pss. 83-89 were added as later gleanings. The third collection must, he thinks, have been made considerably later, and contains almost exclusively the later and latest psalms down to Simon, the founder of the Asmonæan dynasty (142 ff. B. C.). Baethgen recognizes these well-defined stages in the composition of the Psalter, but thinks that their dates cannot be determined in detail. He holds that the superior limit of time is the exile and the inferior the date of the Greek version.

It will be seen from this glance at scholarly opinion that much would be gained if we could determine the condition of the Psalter in the time of the chronicler. Ewald, Cornill, and Peters have held that the greater part of it had then been collected, and that its main divisions were then in existence. On the other hand, W. R. Smith held that "though 1 Chron., chap. 16, and 2 Chron. 6:41-42 contain a series of passages from psalms of the third collection, there is no proof that the chronicler read these hymns in their place in the present Psalter, or even that in his days Ps. 106 existed in its present form."¹⁴ Reuss¹⁵ held and Stade¹⁶ holds that the hymn in 1 Chron., chap. 16, is a late addition to Chronicles, and that, therefore, nothing can be argued from it as to the date of the Psalter.

If we view the matter in the light of historical probability, we should represent the course of the collection of the Psalter somewhat as follows: This collection is palpably the hymnal of the second temple; there is, therefore, a presumption in favor of the view that it was begun in the early days of the history of that temple. Psalm-books may have existed before the exile, and may have furnished some hymns to this early post-exilic collection, but in such an intellectually vigorous and creative period as that which produced the book of Job, the priestly legislation, and completed the Pentateuch, it is hardly

¹² *New World*, June, 1893, p. 306. ¹⁴ *Op. cit.*, 2d ed., p. 202. ¹⁵ § 474.

¹³ *The Literature of the Old Testament*, London and New York, 1899, p. 145.

¹⁶ *Geschichte Israels*, Vol. II, p. 215, n. 1.

likely that a pre-exilian psalter would be adopted without revision. The presence in Book I of such psalms as 16, 17, and 22, which can hardly have originated before the exile, points definitely to a post-exilian origin for this collection. The recent investigations of Van Hoonacker, Kosters, Cheyne, and Torrey in early post-exilian history make it improbable that such a collection would be made before the days of Ezra and Nehemiah. We are thus led to accept, on this point, the conclusion of von Lengerke, Cornill, and Kautzsch. The lapse of time necessary for the various steps of the process by which Books II and III were collected would occupy, one would think, most of the remaining years of the Persian period. When Books IV and V were formed, the musical terms employed in Books II and III were mostly obsolete; a further considerable lapse of time is necessary to account for this. Thus we are brought well into the Greek period, in which no time appears so probable for such a collection as the period of the revival of national feeling under the Maccabees. This conclusion coincides with that of W. R. Smith and Kautzsch.

On this view our inferior limit for the date of the Psalter is to be sought, not by the evidence of the book of Chronicles, but in the Greek version. W. R. Smith, reasoning from the prologue to Ecclesiasticus, held that a Greek version of the Psalms was in existence by 130 B. C.¹⁷ Professor Sanday¹⁸ places the limit about 100 B. C., while Baethgen¹⁹ now places it about 140 B. C.

If now we come back to Ps. 44 and seek to determine its date, its position in the Psalter renders the Maccabæan origin of the psalm highly improbable. If we apply to it the considerations which Sanday has applied to Ps. 79,²⁰ we must suppose that after its composition and before the making of the Greek version the following steps intervened: (1) the superscription "sons of Korah" was attached, and this was probably not immediately; (2) its inclusion in the Korahitic collection; (3) the combination of the Korahitic, Asaphic, and Davidic collections into one; (4) their division into Books II and III; (5) the lapse of sufficient time for the musical terms in them to be forgotten; (6) the collection of Books IV and V; (7) the omission of this collection after Ps. 106, so that the Psalter should consist of five books; (8) the lapse of some time during which the variation of the titles of the psalms in the LXX from those of the Massoretic text arose. Now, if we suppose that Ps. 44 was composed during the earliest years of the

¹⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 201.

¹⁹ *Psalmen*, 2d ed.

¹⁸ *Inspiration*, p. 272.

²⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 271.

persecution of Antiochus, say about 168 B. C., even if we date the Greek version as late as 100 B. C., the time is far too limited for all the steps of this process.

This fact W. R. Smith recognized in the second edition of his *Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, where he complains that Cornill, Driver, and Cheyne do "not give sufficient weight to the only sound principle for the historical study of the Psalter, viz., that the discussion of the age of the individual psalm must be preceded by an inquiry into the date of the several collections."²¹ We might now include Baethgen and Wellhausen in the same complaint. Smith referred the psalm, as we noted above, to the reign of Artaxerxes Ochus and the widespread insurrection in Syria and Phœnicia which was put down in Judæa, according to Josephus, by Bagoses. Smith did not accept Josephus' account of the matter, but based his theory of the widespread revolt, and the ruthless and sacrilegious method of its suppression — a method which might, he thought, justify the language of this psalm — on the chronicle of Eusebius and the work of Diodorus.²²

This theory supposes that the psalm originated about 350 B. C., and would fulfil the necessary conditions if (1) we were sure that the circumstances of these times were such as to warrant such language as: *כִּי עָלֶיךָ הִרְגָנוּ כָּל־הַיּוֹם נִחְשְׁבָנוּ כְּצֹאן טְבָהָה*; and (2) if vss. 2-9 were not, as Peters²³ pointed out, really a song of triumph. Such words as: *כִּי הוֹשַׁעְתָּנוּ מִצָּרֵינוּ וּמִשְׁנֵאֵינוּ הַכִּישׁוֹת*; which even Wellhausen renders²⁴ at present,

Thou helpest us against our foes,
And humblest those who hate us,

can come neither from the time of Bagoses nor from the times of the Maccabees. As Dr. Peters²³ has pointed out, the original of the psalm must be of comparatively early date, and its sad conclusion must be a later editorial expansion. We know of no period when Israelitish arms triumphed, between the exile and the triumphs of the Maccabees. As this latter period has been shown to be too late, we are forced to consider vss. 1-8 as an ode which celebrates some pre-exilic triumph of the Israelitish arms. This is the less difficult, since the next psalm (45) celebrates the marriage of a pre-exilian king of Israel. This we hold to be self-evident, in spite of the attempt of Cheyne²⁵ to refer it to the

²¹ P. 437.

²⁴ "Polychrome Bible."

²² *Op. cit.*, pp. 438, 439.

²⁵ *Origin of the Psalter*, pp. 166-71.

²³ *New World*, June, 1893, p. 302.

marriage of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and of Olshausen to refer it to the marriage of the Syrian king Alexander to Cleopatra (1 Macc. 10 : 57, 58). It may be urged that the similarity between the opening of Ps. 44 and Pss. 78, 89, and 105, which review the history of Israel, would lead one to suppose that this historical retrospect betrays a post-exilic habit of mind. We might thus argue if we had only Ps. 105, for it is based on the combined narratives of J, E, and P, but surely such psalms might have been written at any time after the J and E documents had been composed. Ps. 78, as Briggs has pointed out,⁴⁶ mentions the seven plagues of J, the manna and quails of J, and the miracles of clearing the sea and the water from the rock from E. Since it omits the plagues of E, Briggs concludes that it was written before J and E were united. If, then, we suppose vss. 2-9 of Ps. 44 to be pre-exilic, it is easy to account for the position of the psalm in the Psalter.

We have further to note that vss. 2-9 form about one-third of the psalm, and that they are marked off by the musical direction סִלְהָ. Wellhausen divides the remaining portion into two nearly equal parts at vs. 17, so that the poem, as it now stands, consists of three strophes of nearly equal length: the first, this ode of triumph which we have discussed; the second, a complaint called forth by the defeat of the national arms—a complaint couched in such terms that it fits very well an unsuccessful revolt; and the third, a complaint of a religious persecution: "For thy sake we are continually killed off." Now, of these three strophes only the first and second are separated by סִלְהָ; it is wanting between the second and third. This difference is as old as the LXX, which writes *διάψαλμα* after vs. 9, but nowhere else in the psalm. The first strophe fits pre-exilic conditions, the second the conditions of the time of Bagoses, and the third the conditions of the Maccabæan revolt. Now, I would suggest that these facts point to the following history for the psalm, viz.: a pre-exilic ode of triumph was in the days of Bagoses given another strophe to make the psalm express the feelings of the Israel of that period, and the term סִלְהָ was then placed between the two strophes. In the time of the Maccabees the third strophe was added, but at this time the term סִלְהָ was but little understood, and the expander omitted to insert it.

GEORGE A. BARTON.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE,
Bryn Mawr, Pa.

⁴⁶ *Hexateuch*, p. 148.